

## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated March 24, 2006. Applicant has amended Claim 21 to more particularly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written restriction requirement. In particularly, the Official Action objected to the term “agnostic network.” Applicant has amended Claim 21 to remove this term.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 13, 14, 18 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Russell*. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Official Action stated that “*Russell* teaches allowing access in accordance with confirmation [0091].” Applicant respectfully submits that this does not accurately recite the limitation in Applicant’s claims. Claim 1 includes the limitation of “validating the client system to have access to the server resource in accordance with such confirmation.” Thus, Applicant does not recite merely allowing access in accordance with a confirmation, but instead recites the step of actually validating the client system to have access in accordance with a confirmation. Allowing access and validating the client system to have access are distinctly different concepts. Allowing an access enables a single access based upon a confirmation. The step of validating the client system recited in Applicant’s Claim 1 validates an entire client system to have access to a server rather than merely allowing a single access to the server. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Official Action has not specifically recited each and every element of Claim 1, and thus, Claim 1 is not invalidated by the *Russell* reference under Section 102.

Claim 8 recites the step of “selectively receiving access to the server resource over the IP network depending on a validation of the client system by the server system by confirming that the IP network address corresponds to an authorized geographic location.” This limitation is very similar to that of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8, and all claims dependent therefrom, are distinguishable from the *Russell* reference for similar reasons.

Claim 11 includes the limitation of “instructions for validating the client system to have access to the server resource in accordance with such confirmation.” Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is allowable over the *Russell* reference for similar reasons to those discussed with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 18 includes the limitation of “instructions for selectively receiving access to the server resource over the IP network depending on a validation of the client system by the server system by confirming that the IP network address corresponds to an authorized geographic location.” Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18, and all claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russell* in view of *Alcorn*. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims, being dependent upon previously discussed claims, are allowable for similar reasons as the *Alcorn* reference fails to overcome the shortcomings of *Russell*.

Claims 5, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russell* in view of *Joao*. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims, being dependent upon previously discussed claims, are allowable for similar reasons as the *Joao* reference does not overcome the shortcomings of *Russell*.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russell* in view of *Thompson*. Claim 21 has been amended to include the steps of:

- determining a geographically undefined network address of the client system;
- defining at the server a geographic location associated with the network address;
- confirming that the geographic location associated with the network address is associated with an authorized geographic location;

Applicant respectfully submits that these limitations are not disclosed by the combination of *Russell* and *Thompson*. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 21, and all claims dependent therefrom are distinguishable from the art of record and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PAYT-26,278 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant

/Brian D. Walker Reg. #37751/  
Brian D. Walker  
Registration No. 37751

BDW:dd:ljo

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
September 25, 2006